

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LARRY BOWOTO, et al.,

No. C 99-02506 SI

Plaintiffs,

**ORDER RE: ROBINSON UROUPA
DEPOSITION**

v.

CHEVRONTEXACO CORP., et al.,


Defendants.

By letter briefs, the parties bring before the Court a discovery dispute regarding the upcoming deposition of Robinson Uroupa. At a November 9, 2005, case management conference, the Court ruled that defendants could question Uroupa for ten minutes regarding the forged verification of Obele Ignone. The parties now seek clarification of the scope of questioning that the Court contemplated in its ruling.

To the extent there is a difference between the parties' positions,¹ the Court agrees with plaintiffs. Defendants may question Uroupa about the statements John Ikenyan made in his interrogatory responses, but may not go beyond those statements to question Uroupa about other conversations he may have had with Ikenyan or Ignone.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 15, 2005



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge

¹There may not be. Defendant's own description of what they seek is "*to examine Mr. Uroupa on this new statement by Mr. Ikenyan* and determine whether it refreshes his recollection that he in fact committed, and admitted to, the forgery." Def. Br. at 1 (emphasis added).

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LARRY BOWOTO, et al.,

No. C 99-02506 SI

Plaintiffs,

**ORDER RE: ROBINSON UROUPA
DEPOSITION**

v.

CHEVRONTEXACO CORP., et al.,


Defendants.

By letter briefs, the parties bring before the Court a discovery dispute regarding the upcoming deposition of Robinson Uroupa. At a November 9, 2005, case management conference, the Court ruled that defendants could question Uroupa for ten minutes regarding the forged verification of Obele Ignone. The parties now seek clarification of the scope of questioning that the Court contemplated in its ruling.

To the extent there is a difference between the parties' positions,¹ the Court agrees with plaintiffs. Defendants may question Uroupa about the statements John Ikenyan made in his interrogatory responses, but may not go beyond those statements to question Uroupa about other conversations he may have had with Ikenyan or Ignone.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 15, 2005


SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge

¹There may not be. Defendant's own description of what they seek is "*to examine Mr. Uroupa on this new statement by Mr. Ikenyan* and determine whether it refreshes his recollection that he in fact committed, and admitted to, the forgery." Def. Br. at 1 (emphasis added).